FILED\*()6 MAY ()4 14:36USDC-ORP

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF OREGON

WARREN COVEY BROWN,	)
Plaintiff,	) Case No. 05-1293-PK
VS.	ORDER
IAN DUNCAN, GARTH GULICK, JAN DAHLIN, STEPHEN SMITH, IRENE	)
FOLKMAN, and JOHN and JANE DOES	)
1-10,	) )
Defendants.	)

Michelle R. Burrows 618 N. W. Glisan, Suite 203 Portland, Oregon 97209

Attorney for Plaintiff

Hardy Myers
Attorney General
Leonard W. Williamson
Assistant Attorney General
Department of Justice
1162 Court Street N. E.
Salem, Oregon 97301-4096

Attorneys for Defendants

KING, Judge:

The Honorable Paul Papak, United States Magistrate Judge, filed Findings and Recommendation on March 22, 2006. The matter is before this court. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Defendants have filed objections to the Findings and Recommendation. Plaintiff has filed a response.

When either party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore

Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Having given a *de novo* review of the issues raised in defendants' objections to the Findings and Recommendation, I find no error. I do note that on page 5 of the Findings and Recommendation, a typographical error appears. The date Brown received a response to his grievance was March 21, 2005, and not March 21, 2006.

///

Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Papak's Findings and Recommendation (#29), with the modification noted above, and DENY Defendants' Motion to Dismiss–Failure to Exhaust (#8).

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_\_ day of May, 2006.

Garr M. King

United States District Judge